

COPYRIGHT WARNING

Notice: warning concerning copyright restrictions

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH BECOMES ANGLICAN

(The Reign of Queen Elizabeth I)

Thomas B. Hubbard

Episcopal Theological School

Spring, 1964

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirement
for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

TO HEIDI ELISABETH

whose determination rivals
that of the Tudor Queen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Early Reformation Background (1528-1558)	1
II. Elizabeth's First Steps (1558-1562)	10
III. Continuing Diversity (1563-1570)	18
IV. Roman and Puritan Disaffection (1570-1575)	26
V. Interlude in Discipline (1575-1583)	34
VI. Renewed Stringency (1583-1588)	41
VII. Concluding Clashes (1588-1603)	50
VIII. Reflections on Forty-five Years	57

EARLY REFORMATION BACKGROUND

The Reformation of the Church in England was basically of political origins, and commenced more than ten years after the Continental reforms. Even under the unifying aegis of the Roman Catholic Church, the British people were of quite a different stamp from European Christians and they affected a markedly different kind of Reformation. It could be said with some justification that for many years it was King Henry VIII's Reformation: his hand was discernible behind important and seemingly insignificant events alike. Parliament appeared superfluous to his intents, so he did not summon it. The Archbishop of Canterbury and legate from the Pope, Thomas Cardinal Wolsey, knew his King well, and both anticipated and carried out his plans with finesse and dispatch. Henry left most ecclesiastical details to Wolsey but was carefully informed and acutely perceptive of them. As Trevelyan puts it, "The Cardinal ruled and Henry watched."¹ It was not lost on him, for instance, that one man was effectively controlling the Church without more than token reference to the Pope.² The time was ripe for an Erastian prince in England, and Henry had the makings of one.

Henry's most salient characteristic was his willfulness, which was the undoing of many of his subjects. Begetting no

male heir by Katherine of Aragon, he sought an annulment through his legate from the Pope. A Queen regnant was virtually unheard of, and Henry wanted to secure his line. For political rather than religious reasons an annulment proved inexpedient to Clement VII: Katherine's nephew, Charles V, was the powerful Holy Roman Emperor, from whom Clement would have rightly feared reprisals. Thus Wolsey failed his sovereign, was removed from his post, and died on the way to trial for treason.³

New Hope had dawned however, as it came to Henry's ears that an obscure Cambridge don, Thomas Cranmer, had conceived an idea which might extricate the Crown from its difficult position. Submit the case to the universities of Europe, Cranmer suggested, and let their verdicts be presented to the Pope. Henry was quite willing to do this, for he knew he could obtain favorable decisions from a majority by bribery or political pressure. When the opinions were given, they were sent to the Pope together with a petition on Henry's behalf signed by many notable Englishmen. The object was to have Henry's case heard in an English court, where its success would be assured. Clement refused, and Archbishop Warham would not defy him to please his King.⁴ Henry's stand was portentous of his developing attitude toward ecclesiastical power; either the Church would bend to him, or he would somehow bend it.

He thereupon began what was to become a series of royal and parliamentary actions designed to elevate the position of

the King in the English Church, humble the clergy and cut them off from papal jurisdiction. The Erastian prince had come into his own. The clergy were forced to acknowledge Henry as "their single protector, only and supreme lord, and, as far as the law of Christ allows, even Supreme Head."⁵ "A Supplication against the Ordinaries" was made in Parliament; this was an exaggerated list of grievances against the bishops which was used as the basis for bringing ecclesiastical legislation under the power of the King. Also, by the Conditional Restraint of Annates, the King was given the authority to stop payments to Rome of a bishop's first year's revenue. The latter act was a weapon which Henry could use, if needed, in the annulment battle.⁶ He and Anne Boleyn were secretly married, probably in November, 1532.

With the death of Archbishop Warham, new possibilities arose. Henry managed to secure the appointment for his ally, Cranmer, who had previously made reservations regarding his archepiscopal oath. It would be binding, he said, only insofar as it did not commit him to violate the law of God, or disobey the King or laws of England.⁷ Now it was expedient that the laws of the land conform to the situation as it was taking shape, to assure succession for the child who was to be born to Henry and Anne in the fall of 1533. The Act in Restraint of Appeals enunciated the radical concept that the King was head of both Church and State, and no appeals were to be made "to any foreign princes or potentates,"⁸ (meaning, of course, the Pope). This act is rightly referred to by

many as the basis of the English Reformation, though it may not have been conceived with such far-reaching consequences in mind. Whether or not he desired it, Henry was headed for a break with Rome.

Convocation was persuaded to open the way for a formal statement against Katherine, and Cranmer made it, declaring her marriage to Henry invalid, and Anne rightful Queen of England. The Pope replied that the reverse was true, and excommunicated the King. Henry made use of the Conditional Restraint of Annates, and appealed his case to a general council of the Church. This appeal was not granted, and the break with Rome was finally formalized.⁹

Princess Elizabeth was born on September 7, 1533, and Henry moved to consolidate his gains and further secure her position and that of all Anne's progeny. Early in 1534 Parliament passed the Act in Absolute Restraint of Annates, applying the powers granted conditionally by the earlier act and prohibiting the Pope from participation in episcopal appointment. The King now had legal as well as practical power to create bishops. Other legislation included termination of the payment of "Peter's Pence" to Rome, forbidding appeal to the Pope for dispensations (now to come through the See of Canterbury), placing monasteries under the control of the King, giving the State responsibility for punishing heresy, granting legal status to the oaths and promises extracted earlier from the clergy (the Supremacy Act), and, finally, further clarification about the status of Henry's children by Anne. "The Bishop of

Rome" was excluded from interference in such temporal matters, Cranmer's judgment was declared final, and it was treason to speak, act or write otherwise. Tentative lines for a national Church were being laid down. Thomas Cromwell, Chancellor to the King, used the provisions of this statute to promote propaganda against the Pope, sent out spies to catch those who disobeyed it, and made extensive use of an oath of allegiance to the King among those suspected of being out of sympathy with him. A number of people were executed under this statute, including Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More. Most men, however, were willing to put up with a great deal from Henry, due to his personal appeal and the exalted idea of sovereignty which was prevalent.¹⁰

The only significant opposition to him from commoners came when he dissolved first the smaller monasteries, then the larger ones. This was the closest that the Reformation had actually come to the layman; until then, he had been able to go about his daily life much the same as ever. The Pilgrimage of Grace, 1536-7, was a reaction to Henry's decision that he needed the money which could be obtained by dispossessing the monks of the Church's property. This uprising was neither large nor of long duration, but was important as the only organized attempt to gainsay Henry by his common subjects. Monasteries were a part of the life of many communities, and people saw them go with nostalgia, but few were really willing to risk anything for them. Cromwell noted this and, in his usual unprincipled manner, stepped up proceedings.

Anne failed to produce a male heir, and Henry grew impatient. In 1536, the year Katherine died, he had Anne beheaded and married Jane Seymour. Jane bore him the long-awaited son, but she died in child-birth.

Theological formulations of this period (e.g. the Ten Articles) were deliberately vague, so that Henry's conservative views would not have to be compromised, but the Lutherans, with whom discussions were proceeding, would not lose hope. Cromwell promoted a royal marriage with Anne of Cleves, the immediate failure of which, together with Henry's negative feelings toward the Reformers, whom Cromwell supported resulted in the latter's execution in the summer of 1540. Part of this reaction to the Protestants was the promulgation of the Six Articles. Denial of any of these six points of the catholic faith was grounds for heresy prosecution.¹¹

Henry's reign was in many senses, unfulfilled. His boundless energy was subject to his passions, and much that he originally purposed he later reversed. Liturgical reform was begun by Cranmer, but he was not able to present his work while Henry was King. An English translation of the Bible was begun and then abandoned. Roman rule was renounced but relations between church and state were left ambiguous. As someone has said, Henry opened the flood gates and then tried to control the intrushing sea. He could not channel events entirely to his liking, but he did succeed in blocking the tide rather effectively. A final illustration of the vascillating character of his theological position is that, at his death in 1547, he

left his son in the hands of Protestant guardians and tutors.

Edward was a frail, sickly child of nine when he came to the throne under the care of a Privy Council. He soon disbanded this group, and appointed a new one himself, with his uncle, the Duke of Somerset, as Lord Protector of the Realm. Due to Edward's weak health and the fact that Mary Tudor, his half-sister and a firm Roman Catholic, was next in succession, the Protestant leadership moved slowly. Sermons and some use of the vernacular were introduced into the churches, the cup was returned to the laity after centuries of deprivation, and money designated for requiem masses in chantries was confiscated by the Crown. Then propaganda against the Mass was begun, and Cranmer's Order of Communion, consisting mainly of prayers in English, was inserted into the Mass in 1548. The next year Edward's first Prayer Book was issued and ordered for use throughout the land by the First Act of Uniformity. The major features of this book were that now there was to be a standard liturgical usage in all English parishes, Latin was abolished in favor of the vernacular, and Lutheran influences were felt (though more in language than content). Cranmer showed himself a liturgical expert in the preparation of this book, for which he was largely responsible, drawing upon ancient and venerable liturgies of the Church for his inspiration.¹²

The country was not ready for such a far-reaching reform as this, and Somerset was one of the major sufferers. His place was taken by the Duke of Warwick, who rapidly attempted to become a dictator. Somerset opposed him, and was executed.

Warwick became Duke of Northumberland and, through the King, made his will prevail. A more protestant Prayer Book appeared in 1552, in which Calvinistic influences were seen in attitudes toward such practices as confession, vestments, prayers for the dead, and especially in the theology of the Eucharist. Prospects for its continued use were not bright, however. Edward was failing, and Mary's militant Roman Catholicism would certainly sweep away all such reforms. Northumberland had to find another successor, and his choice was Lady Jane Gray, a descendant of Henry VII. Marrying her off to his son, Northumberland thought he had his perfect puppet queen.

Mary had not been idle, however, and she soon returned to London with considerable support, and entered the city as Queen. Lady Jane, Northumberland and a few others who posed immediate threats to her were executed, but the reign began with relative moderation in this respect. The First Statute of Repeal undid all Cranmer's work, and legally restored the religious situation which existed at Henry's death. However, instead of yielding complete submission to the Pope, Mary retained the Supremacy, using it in an attempt to bring the Church in England back to the Roman fold. The Church had become a kind of department of State, and Mary felt it was wisest to work within the given framework, at least at first. She saw advantages in having a husband to share the rule, and sought one among likely political allies. Philip of Spain was her choice, much to the dismay of her subjects. He ruled an influential country and was an heir to the Emperor, but these

very factors alienated the British. Foreigners were always suspect, and especially so strong a one in a time of English weakness. This alliance was one of Mary's biggest mistakes. The Second Statute of Repeal sought to return religious affairs to the period of 1529, and at least partial submission to the Pope. Reginald Cardinal Pole absolved the realm from its "apostasy," but Parliament had not surrendered unconditionally.¹³

Parker claims that "whatever their legal form, counter-revolutions usually call for victims".¹⁴ The heresy laws were revived and any dissent from the Roman Church was grounds for burning. Archbishop Cranmer and four other bishops of the Church perished in the flames at Smithfield. Perhaps ultimately more disastrous for the Queen, however, was the decision to martyr hundreds of commoners. It was customary for a regime to rid itself of its powerful enemies, but the wholesale slaughter of ignorant peasants in the Marian persecution turned the country against its Queen. Then, too, England became embroiled in war with France, due to Philip's dispute with her in his role as King of Spain. There were heavy English losses, including the last Continental holding, Calais. Thus, at Mary's death in 1558, England had become thoroughly disillusioned with the brief return to the Roman Catholic Church.

ELIZABETH'S FIRST STEPS

Elizabeth was but twenty-five years old when she acceded to the throne of this troubled country. Not only were foreign affairs dismal, but the treasury was low, defenses weak, the Church enigmatic and her legitimacy (and thus, her claim to the throne) in question. Elizabeth was to prove herself more than equal to this complex situation.

"She was wise in this world's wisdom--resourceful, self-reliant, cautious and morally courageous in moments of stress. But she had lived too long in an atmosphere of plot and intrigue to cultivate the virtue of magnanimity--it was a luxury she could ill afford; and suspicion was a second nature to her."¹⁵

Her wisdom and caution were soon to be seen in her attitude toward religion. Those who awaited her inclination on Church matters continued to wait. It seemed likely that she would remain a Papist (she had attended Mass during the Marian persecution), but there were distracting facts which made this at least questionable. The Commandments, Epistle and Gospel, Lord's Prayer and the Litany were authorized in the vernacular, and strictures against protestants were relaxed somewhat. Those of liberal persuasion who had been exiled under Mary began to filter back into the country, and make their presence known by propagation of the new teachings of Geneva and Frankfurt. However, Mary's ambassador to the Pope was retained in Rome, with instructions that a diplomatic mission was soon to be appointed. The Edwardian petitions against the Pope in the Litany were removed, as was the infamous Black Rubric which

stated that kneeling to receive the Sacrament did not imply a transubstantiation doctrine. An "Ornaments Rubric" was added, which effected a return to the vestments and Church furniture of the period of Edward's First Prayer Book. Finally, the catholic words of administration of the 1549 prayer book were to be conjoined with the more protestant words of 1552, thus re-opening the door for a doctrine of Real Presence. The overall effect of this confusing policy was to excite the hopes of all parties that they might receive support from the Queen. No one was satisfied, but all were encouraged that a religious settlement of their liking might be forthcoming. By thus playing for time, Elizabeth was able to strengthen and consolidate her kingdom without having any outspoken religious opponents with whom to contend. Even Philip of Spain enjoined the Pope to be patient while he tried to approach England with diplomacy to win her back to the Church, possibly by marrying Elizabeth.¹⁶

Sir William Cecil was appointed secretary to the Queen, a position of great responsibility which he filled to the extreme satisfaction of his sovereign. It may have been he who drafted the semi-secret document, "A Device for the Alteration of Religion", which predicted events and reactions across Europe upon the advent of proposed changes in the English church. It was also a guide to Elizabethan policy, suggesting plundering the clergy and defying the Pope, restraining the more extreme protestants, and indulging in somewhat unscrupulous political

maneuvers.¹⁷ Most important, it suggests the outline of both the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity which were soon to be enacted under Elizabeth's first Parliament.

The Queen had never used the phrase, "Supreme Head" of the Church, but had substituted for it in her official title an innocuous "etc." When Parliament began to consider her legislation, they found that she wished to be designated "Supreme Governor" of the Church of England. This had a somewhat less offensive ring to it than did Henry's phrase, but had basically the same meaning. The Pope was still to be excluded from the affairs of the English Church. This idea was incorporated in the Supremacy Bill which came before this first Elizabethan Parliament in the spring of 1559.

"May it...please your Highness, for the repressing of the said usurped foreign power and the restoring of the rights, jurisdictions, and preeminences appertaining to the imperial Crown of this your realm, That it may be enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, That the said Act (Mary's Second Statute of Repeal)....be repealed, and shall from thenceforth be utterly void and of none effect."¹⁸

A Uniformity Bill was concerned to restore the second Edwardian Prayer Book (with the changes noted above, the Ornaments Rubric, new words of administration, and the omission of the Black Rubric) as the standard for worship throughout the realm. Frere assesses the Supremacy Bill as a return to the Henrician relationship with the Pope, except that provision was made for the appointment of an ecclesiastical commission to implement the directives of the Sovereign and judge heresy.¹⁹ Stiff opposition was encountered in both houses, much of it due to the remaining Marian bishops, and both bills had to be modified

considerably before they were acceptable to the dissenting faction. The Uniformity Bill passed by only a narrow margin, and its administration was to be divided between civil justices and bishops (lines of demarcation of jurisdiction were unfortunately undefined). Strictly speaking, these two Acts comprise the Elizabethan Settlement, and set the tone for the Church which was to develop over the next forty years and, according to Neill, which exists virtually the same today.²⁰

Popular reaction to these acts was a rash of iconoclasm in London, but this was of relatively short duration. As Black points out, it would be more than twenty years before the meaning of the Settlement filtered down to the commoners. Ecclesiastical change had been frequent over the preceding three reigns, and it was only with time that any real impact could be made upon the popular mind.²¹ The government was determined to make sure that it was well known that the Queen was claiming no new prerogatives for herself by these actions. This was the same kind of authority which sovereigns always held over ecclesiastical bodies, they said, and the Crown claimed no "power of ministry of divine offices in the Church." What was not mentioned was that, while the Queen was exercising a needful role of guidance and support of the Church in a time of its weakness, she was also setting precedents which would later be used to control it over the opposition of its bishops.²²

An ecclesiastical commission was appointed to begin enforcing the Acts of the Settlement in May. Foremost among

their duties was the administration of an oath of allegiance under the Supremacy Act, to be taken by all employed by Church or Crown. This placed the Marian bishops in jeopardy, for their loyalty to Rome was declared treasonable under the old dictum of praemunire. The episcopate had dwindled to eleven prior to this time (the income of the vacant sees being collected by the Crown, which was therefore not over-zealous to fill them), and ten of these were eventually deprived for refusing the oath. A royal visitation of all dioceses was begun in the summer of 1559, and a number of injunctions set forth. Relics, images and miracles were inveighed against, preaching and Bible reading were promoted, clerical garb and marriage were placed under regulation, and religious controversy was to be avoided (all printing was to be licensed by the Crown, to prevent seditious literature). Church attendance was enjoined, and orderliness especially stressed. Kneeling and reverencing the name of Jesus were encouraged.²³

The Queen had been trying since early in December to obtain as Archbishop of Canterbury the former Dean of Lincoln, Matthew Parker. He was a retiring, scholarly man who protested his inadequacy and dislike for the post for the better part of a year. He pleaded with the Queen, "If you mean good to me, procure me not anything above the reach of my ability, to disappoint expectation and cumber my conscience toward God."²⁴ Finally his resistance was worn down, and he was quickly elected. Due to an oversight, the Ordinal had not been included

in the Act of Uniformity, so a special writ had to be issued to validate it. Then a couple of the bishops who had been deprived under Mary were reinstituted and two suffragans were brought in to complete the number necessary for consecration of an Archbishop. Though all this was hastily improvised, it had been done with care, and Parker was consecrated at Lambeth December 17, 1559 with abundant attestation.

Further consecrations took place that winter and spring, until all the sees again had pastors. This done, the crisis seemed to be past, and the Privy Council advised that the government of the Church be turned over to its spiritual leaders. As has been indicated, such was not to be the case.

Elizabeth was determined to have at least outward conformity to the religious settlement she had established, and she began to seek it at the top. Those deprived Marian bishops who would not take the oath of Supremacy were given time to reconsider, then placed under arrest. Among them, only David Pole remained at liberty, and he until his death in 1568. From the bishops' viewpoint, they were martyrs for conscience, but to the Crown, they were technically traitors, owing allegiance to a foreign power rather than their Queen.²⁵

Parish priests were evidently less scrupulous than bishops, for most of them quietly became members of the establishment. Perhaps they had more faith in the Queen's statement that she did not want to make a window into men's souls, but only asked for visible conformity. Thus there was a strong conservative

element in the priesthood which was to prove troublesome in the days to come. As the iconoclastic furor subsided in the face of a more organized Church, the conservatives emerged as a problem to the Queen.

Elizabeth was playing the coquette with Pius IV over the Council of Trent. Invitations had been issued to representatives of all Christendom to be present at this great "reforming" Council, but Elizabeth claimed to be distressed that the Pope had classified her as a Protestant sovereign. Negotiations took place in a charged atmosphere, and finally Elizabeth refused to receive the nuncio sent to make final arrangements for English representation. It seems that her actions were governed much more by political considerations than religious ones; indeed, this was a marked characteristic of her reign. The presence of papal nuncios had a tendency to provide a rallying point for latent Roman Catholic (Recusant) antagonism toward her government (as did the Spanish ambassador), and she was not yet secure enough to be willing to risk large-scale opposition.²⁶ There seems to be evidence that Pius was in a bargaining mood and might have been willing to confirm the catholicity of the English Prayer Book and permit the Recusants to comply with Church attendance laws. He was never given the chance.

The decision to rebuff papal overtures carried with it a concomitant severity toward Recusants. The Spanish Embassy was placed under surveillance and frequent English visitors to

it were interrogated about their activities. The Marian bishops were placed under stricter regulations in prison.

A sizeable body of literature grew out of the ensuing controversy about the suppression or freedom of Recusancy. The most famous work was done by John Jewel, a returned Marian exile from Frankfort and become Bishop of Salisbury. He disputed with a number of people, the most significant of whom was Thomas Harding. In his renowned book, Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae (1562), Jewel demonstrated from the Fathers, the Councils, Scripture and the primitive Church that the doctrine and practices of the English Church were valid and in the ancient tradition. Since England would not be represented at Trent, Jewel's book rapidly became her acknowledged apology to the Christian world. As Jewel said repeatedly,

"We have searched out of the Holy Bible, which we are sure cannot deceive, one sure form of religion, and have returned again unto the primitive church of the ancient fathers and apostles, that is to say, to the first ground and beginning of things, as unto the very foundations and headsprings of Christ's church."²⁷

CONTINUING DIVERSITY

When Parliament and Convocation met in 1563, the diversity of religious belief, practice and discipline throughout England was virtually incredible. Recusant Roman Catholics were hearing Latin Masses under little proscription or punishment; Conformists of various hues were quite vocal; Nonconformists presented a panoply which foreshadowed modern denominationalism. All the while, the Queen was calling for uniformity and her voice seemed lost upon her violently disputing subjects. Yet she was to win the day through long, patient labor. Her Tudor heritage would brook no compromise in matters of ultimate concern.

The administrative difficulties which Elizabeth and Parker faced appeared insuperable. Medieval discipline had broken down, and nothing had been put in its place. Clerical problems were rampant. Church property was often in ruins and ecclesiastical affairs throughout the realm were in disorder. There were too few clergy, and pluralism resulted. Many cures were held by laymen or boys in school (fortunately a minority of these were cures of souls). It is estimated that between fifteen and twenty-five per cent of the clergy were non-resident.²⁸ To meet this situation, laymen were licensed as readers: they supplanted some of the minor orders, and could officiate at the daily offices, read prepared homilies and catechize children. Some were also permitted to church women and bury the dead.

Wholesale dissatisfaction raged with regard to services in the Church, as can be imagined from the divergent viewpoints outlined above. The returned exiles were scandalized by the crucifix which remained in the Queen's chapel, the "popish dress" of the clergy, and the "idolatrous" ornaments of the Church. Romans, of course, regarded the established Church as heretical, but caused relatively little trouble so long as they could attend an 'official' service and then hear Mass unmolested.

Into this milieu in 1563 the bishops introduced the Thirty-nine Articles, a revision of the Forty-two from 1553. These were meant as a definitive statement on the knotty theological problems of the day. Transubstantiation was repudiated since "it cannot be proved by Holy Writ,; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions."²⁹ Predestination was treated in somewhat general terms in an attempt to avoid the Calvinistic probing of the inner recesses of God's providence. It was eight years until these Articles were officially ratified.

The Parliament enacted legislation which broadened the scope of excommunication to include heresy, refusal of the Sacraments or absence from Church, "error in matters of religion or doctrine now received," and several moral offences.³⁰ The "Act for the assurance of the Queen's royal power over all estates and subjects within her domains" was equally

important, for in it provision was made to invoke praemunire against any who acknowledged "the authority, jurisdiction, power or pre-eminence of the Bishop of Rome or his see" in England. A second offense was considered high treason,³¹ This type of legislation, inspired by Elizabeth and her advisors, was the core of discipline in the Church. George Withers, a perhaps somewhat disenchanted but nonetheless accurate contemporary, stated it this way:

The clergy discuss and ordain; they may have a wide cognizance, and make as many constitutions as they like; but nothing stands, nothing runs, without the Queen and the Archbishop.³²

And the Queen chose to run the Church through the Parliament.

She demanded investigation of the diverse religious practices in a royal edict of 1565. The confusion can be seen in some pertinent remarks culled from the observations of Grindal, Bishop of London.

Some say the service and prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church...some keep precisely to the order of the book, others intermeddle psalms in metre; some say in a surplice, others without a surplice; the Table standeth in the body of the church in some places, in others it standeth in the chancel... administration of the Communion is done by some with surplice and cap, some with surplice alone, others with none; some with chalice, some with a communion cup, others with a common cup; some with unleavened bread, some with leavened.³³

This was the situation which was called the Vestarian controversy, as to what garments were to be worn by clergy officiating at services and on the street. Those influenced by Continental reforms issued a booklet called, "A briefe Discourse against the outwarde Apparell and Ministring Garmentes

of the Popish Church," claiming that the clothing and vestments of the Conformists were offensive to godly men and encouraging papists. The Queen's reply was to imprison the printers of the booklet and then speak out against it in an official government publication.³⁴ Throttling the opposition was not to prove effective, however, and Parker soon perceived the depth of the problem to be much greater than surplices and caps. The little booklet so quickly suppressed was the harbinger of a long struggle with Nonconformity which was to plumb the depths of the Church's self-understanding.

The Archbishop was in a peculiar position between the Queen and the Church, for he did the bidding of the former in operating the latter, but had to do so as if on his own. Elizabeth would give him no public support for the reforms and discipline which she required of him, for her popularity might be endangered thereby. So it was that the Advertisements appeared as though entirely on Parker's own authority. This document dealt with doctrine and preaching, prayer and Sacraments, polity and vestments. Concessions were made on some points to the Nonconformists, but they were to expect strict enforcement of the Archbishop's policies. This might work hardships in some quarters, but that was to be expected.

Of two rival and equally intolerant parties, (the Nonconformist) was the novel and the weaker party; and therefore his lot was sure to be a hard one until either he could get the upper hand of the more catholic churchman and become the oppressor, or else both sides could learn mutual toleration.³⁵

In fact, the Churchmen were renowned among all save their opponents as extremely lenient; powerful parties of the day rarely took into consideration any rights of dissenters.

Until this time, the Nonconformists had been willing to remain almost entirely within the Church, trying to work as leaven in the loaf, to reform it from inside. The year 1567, as nearly as can be determined, was the time when Separatism began to be a force to reckon with. Discouraged by few successes and many defeats, men of firm conviction (and often short temper) banded together in defiance of the laws prohibiting services other than in harmony with the prayer book. When the churches were closed to them, they met in secret conventicles in all manner of buildings and homes. Sometimes these meetings would be raided by law enforcement officials, and all the worshippers imprisoned. An account of a typical trial is given by Dixon, (6:166ff). The defendants had been absent from their parish churches and held other gatherings at which they prayed, preached and administered the Sacraments according to their own uses. The Bishop (Grindal of London) asked whether they did not have preaching and Sacraments in their parishes, and the reply was that they always attended the same until the introduction of "idolatrous gear"; papists now ministered in the parish churches; and Christ was preached as priest and prophet but not as king. The Bishop said they were here speaking against the Queen's majesty, but they only protested the louder, and were hence returned to prison.

Recusants were not in an irenic mood at this time, either. The Council of Trent had made some private statements in committee which were derogatory to Elizabeth's position. These were followed by a new policy of militancy by Pius V, who acceded in 1566. The Roman see would no longer be beguiled by Elizabeth's coy tactics nor dissuaded by assurances from Philip of Spain that he would win her back to the true faith. A large-scale campaign to subvert the Crown was undertaken by a unique enterprise based in France. A seminary for training Englishmen as priests to infiltrate England was founded in 1568. These valiant young men were at first cautioned to avoid all political involvement and disputation, and to bend all their efforts to the conversion of heretics. It was reasoned that, when sufficient numbers had returned to acknowledging the Pope, political revolution would follow of its own accord and the realm would again be papist. After these earnest "seminary-priests" (most of them Jesuits) were at work in England, Rome began to apply pressure to involve them in encouraging discontent with the Queen and even plotting her assassination. The religious work they were doing was considered treasonable in itself; with these added implications to their presence, the government quickly began to exert all its resources to arrest and execute them. Their presence made life a good deal more strenuous for recusants, for they were continually suspected of harboring traitors, and were placed under harsher strictures.³⁶

Another rallying point for recusant anti-government feeling was Mary, Queen of Scots, cousin to Elizabeth. Seeking political asylum, she ventured into England in May, 1568. Her claim to the English throne was naturally spoken of more openly since she was in the country, and Elizabeth was forced, for her own safety, to detain Mary under arrest.

An eruption occurred in the northern dioceses, which were always sympathetic to the conservative cause. With great courage and altruistic motives, men set out to restore "the true and catholic religion", but were quickly dispersed by the troops of Sussex and Warwick and only minimal punishment exacted.³⁷

Meanwhile, in Rome, some of Elizabeth's exiled subjects were engaged in the preliminaries of what was to be probably the most significant development in the relationship of Pope and Sovereign. A dozen Englishmen, part of the recusant colony at Louvain, were giving testimony which concluded that the Queen had usurped ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Church in England, deprived and imprisoned both bishops and clergy, put in their positions non-episcopal heretics, and required churchmen to disavow their loyalty to the Pope. Following this testimony, on February 25, 1570, Pius issued a bull, Regnans in excelsis, which excommunicated Elizabeth and advocated treasonable acts against her. Roman Catholics had been put into an impossible position in England: either they accepted the papal decree and became subject to penalties of death, or

rejected it and risked excommunication themselves.³⁸ It has been well said that this was a most impolitic move by the Pope, for it gave only untenable choices to his English adherents.

ROMAN AND PURITAN DISAFFECTION

The first response of the government to the bull was taken by the Parliament, under royal direction. The publishing of bulls was made a treasonable offense, as were related recusant activities. Finally, those who fled the country to avoid these laws forfeited their property to the Crown. Thus the split between Rome and London was acknowledged from the British side and steps were taken to secure royal prerogatives and safety. Nonetheless, the Queen persisted in her policy of leniency toward all who swore allegiance to her, regardless of what opinions they might hold privately. Dixon explains this by suggesting that to have divided her realm by persecution of recusants would have been to fall prey to a kind of disunity which could be profitable only to her enemies.³⁹ Therefore the Church in England remained as inclusive as possible, though the minimum proscriptions against recusants had to be taken in the face of the papal edict.

Cecil put it this way:

As long as they shall openly continue in the observance of her laws, and shall not wilfully and manifestly break them by their open actions, her majesty's meaning is, not to have any of them molested by any inquisition or examination of their consciences in causes of religion.⁴⁰

However, now that Roman Catholics had been released from their loyalty to the Queen by papal permission, their oaths could not be considered trustworthy, and repressive measures were inevitable. To this date in Elizabeth's reign, there had been no executions for specifically religious offenses. Now, however,

civil jurisdiction was called upon to hang traitors, who earlier would have been termed heretics and burned under ecclesiastical law.

The other extreme in religious persuasion began to assert itself in a new manner about this time. The Lady Margaret professor at Cambridge was a pious, scholarly man named Thomas Cartwright. In his lectures on the Acts of the Apostles, he made explicit comparisons between the early company of the Apostles and the contemporary English Church. Many felt these were meant as an invidious subversion of the establishment, and soon his name was well known to Cecil. Despite the large support given him by students and fellow professors, he was deprived of his chair. Largely responsible for this was the Master of Trinity College, John Whitgift. Shortly thereafter, Whitgift assumed the position of Vice-Chancellor of the University, which Cartwright's followers felt was rightfully his. So it was that a long and sometimes quite bitter rivalry arose between these two distinguished men.

Many of the abuses in the Church which were being pointed out by the Puritans such as Cartwright were indeed scandalous. Perhaps foremost in importance was the ignorance of many of the clergy; second was the corruption of the ecclesiastical courts. The Canons of 1571 attempting a remedy, built upon the canonical legislation of Henry VIII, and dealt largely with the offices and duties of bishops and lesser clergy. Preachers were instructed to "teach nothing but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old Testament and the New, and that which the

catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have gathered out of that doctrine."⁴¹ Efforts were made to see that clergy pursued biblical studies, and that laity learned their Catechism preliminary to communion, sponsorship or marriage. Lay readers were abolished, and the almuce, a fur tippet worn by many high-ranking ecclesiastics and long attacked by the Puritans, was abandoned. With regard to the latter, Frere says,

If any one thought that such a surrender would pacify the enemy he was greatly mistaken: Cartwright was delighted with this sign of yielding, and at once went on to ask why 'copes, caps, surplices, tippets, and such like baggage' were to be exempted from the same condemnation. It is of no use to make concessions to a declared revolutionary; they only whet his appetite for more.⁴²

The next major onslaught was not long in coming.

Propheying was one of the characteristic marks of Puritanism. This name was given to unofficial, unlicensed gatherings at which there was preaching and interpretation of Scripture. This was an informal way in which the Puritans hoped to fill the gap which they felt in the education of both clergy and laity. The usual procedure was that a minister would give a forty-five minute exposition, receive comments and corrections from the more learned divines, and then a question period from the floor followed.⁴³ However, this was entirely outside the sanction of the Church, and the Queen was not long in finding out about it or voicing her protest. In a letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, she had this to say about the prophesyings in his diocese:

(I would warn you) of the dangerous presumptions of some in these days, who by singular exercises in public places, after their own fancies, have wrought no

good in the minds of the multitude, easy to be carried with novelties: yet forasmuch as we have been sithence credibly informed, that in sundry places of your dioces, namely, in Hertfordshire, those exercises, or, as they term the, propheyinges, are yet, or were very lately continued, to the great offence of our orderly subjects; and therfore, and for divers good respects, we think requisite, that they shall be forbore to be used.⁴⁴

Elizabeth wisely recognized that these meetings were symptomatic of a far-reaching disaffection with the established Church, and desired to suppress them before open rebellion against the episcopal government broke out.

Further grumblings arose from Puritans with the ramification of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, compiled eight years previously and newly-revised. Subscription to these, the Prayer Book and the Royal Supremacy was required of all clergy licensed by Convocation.

All this discontent was background to "An Admonition to Parliament, printed anonymously in 1572. It began with a description of the "true" Church, and contrasted with it the existing Church in England.

It hath ben thought good to proferre to your godly considerations, a true platforme of a church reformed, to the end that it beyng layd before your eyes, to beholde the great unlikenes betwixt it & this our english church: you may learne either with perfect hatred to detest the one, and with singuler love to embrace, and carefull endevoir to plant the other: or els to be without excuse before the majestie of our God....⁴⁵

As always, the criterion was to be "that nothing be don in this or ani other thing, but that which you have the expresse warrant of Gods worde for."⁴⁶ The Prayer Book was described in those now-famous words, "an unperfecte booke, culled & picked out of that popishe dunghil, the Masse booke full of all abominations."⁴⁷

Finally, vestments:

the garments of Balamites, of popish priestes, enemies to God and all Christians. They serve not to edification, they have the shewe of evyll (seyng the popysh priesthode is evyll), they worke discorde, they hinder the preachyng of the Gospel, they kepe the memorie of Egypt styl amongst us, and put us in mynd of the abomination wherunto they in times past have served, they offend the weake, they encourage the obstinate. Therefore can no authoritie by the word of God, with any pretence of order and obedience command them, nor make them in any wyse tollerable, but by circumstances, they are sicked, & against the word of God.⁴⁸

About this time one of the first Roman Catholic plots of the assassination of the Queen was discovered. The Pope's agent, Ridolfi, had been conspiring with the Duke of Norfolk in England and the King of Spain abroad. Following the proposed assassination, they planned a revolt which would place Mary Queen of Scots on the English throne. Norfolk was imprisoned and condemned, but it was difficult to obtain royal permission to execute him. He was dispatched on June 2, 1572, and Mary was kept under close surveillance.

Another printing was made of the "Admonition," and Cartwright himself wrote a "Second Admonition" in defense of the imprisoned authors of the first one. Whitgift was chosen to make the official reply to this, and he directed the main part of his attack to the presuppositions on the equality of all ministers and the complete sufficiency of Scripture.⁴⁹

Throughout this time, the ecclesiastical courts were keeping busy with investigations and trials of Nonconformists, and tracking down their contraband printing presses. It is interesting to note that the government, especially Cecil (now Lord Burghley), was considering reforms along similar lines to

BULL OF EXCOMMUNICATION AGAINST ELIZABETH

February 25, 1570

He that reigns in the highest, to whom has been given all power in heaven and earth, entrusted the government of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church (outside of which is no salvation) to one man alone on the earth, namely to Peter, the chief of the Apostles, and to Peter's successor, the Roman pontiff, in fullness of power. This one man he set up as chief over all nations and all kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, dispose, plant and build...

Resting then upon the authority of him who has willed to place us (albeit unequal to such a burden) in this supreme throne of justice, we declare the aforesaid Elizabeth a heretic and an abettor of heretics, and those that cleave to her in the aforesaid matters to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of Christ's body.

Moreover we declare her to be deprived of her pretended right to the aforesaid realm, and from all dominion, dignity and privilege whatsoever.

And the nobles, subjects and peoples of the said realm, and all others who have taken an oath of any kind to her we declare to be absolved forever from such oath and from all dues of dominion, fidelity and obedience, as by the authority of these presents we do so absolve them; and we deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended right to the realm and all other things aforesaid: and we enjoin and forbid all and several the nobles, etc....that they presume not to obey her and her admonitions, commands and laws. All who disobey our command we involve in the same sentence of anathema.

those demanded by the Puritans. They were not willing, however, to countenance the illegal and extra-ecclesiastical means which that group was using to gain its ends. A better-educated clergy, more teaching for the laity, uniformity and reverence in worship, better Church attendance and keeping Sunday for religious purposes were among the goals of Puritan and Churchman alike.

The bishops at this time were cast in rather demonic roles by their Nonconformist opponents. The popular mind was easily appealed to by the picture of the strong and lofty episcopate oppressing the poor defenseless and unorganized Puritans, and the latter were not loath to promote such a caricature. The facts of illegality and subversion of the established order were deemed insignificant, if pondered at all, by the ordinary man. Fathers-in-God were not viewed as such by many in this period.

Further disaffection developed in 1574 with the translation into English of a Latin work authored by a former colleague of Cartwright at Cambridge. Walter Travers published De disciplina ecclesiastica in Geneva, and Cartwright immediately translated it as A Full and Plaine Declaration of Ecclesiastical Discipline owt off the Word off God, etc. The original was in Latin so that it would be available to more people in the country where it especially applied. The central point was that the Bible laid down the principles for Church government, and that a careful reading would make clear to everyone what that was. Travers believed that it was very obvious that there were two types of Church officers intended by God, a bishop (in the sense of pastor and teacher) and a deacon (as elder and distributor).

This was what he found by his literal (and rather selective) reading of the Bible. Small wonder, though, for others had set a precedent on how the Scriptures ought to be read. Tyndale, for instance:

The Scripture hath but one sense, which is the literal sense, and that literal sense is the root and ground of all, and the anchor that never faileth; whereunto if thou canst never err or go out of the way...if thou leave the literal sense, thou canst not but go out of the way.⁵⁰

The bishop, then, was to be the minister of just one Church. If a teacher, he would be "occupied in the simple teachinge and expoundinge off the holy doctrine and trew religion."⁵¹ If a pastor, he would preach, administer the Sacraments and care for the spiritual well-being of his flock. Some deacons were administrative officers who ruled the Church through a Consistory, and others provided for the poor of the parish. The various individual parishes were to cooperate through an association of presbytery. A final departure from the established Church pattern was that many 'secular' functions were to be turned over to civil officials, rather than continue under ecclesiastical jurisdiction as they had for centuries.

One might think that, with such an impressive show of force as these last few pages have indicated, the Puritans were on their way to becoming a moving, indeed, a governing, force in the realm. Such was not to be the case. The important Puritan leaders were "scattered, distracted, and divided,"⁵² and the government persecution was so effective that they could accomplish little in a concerted manner. The following years were to be lived rather quietly by most Puritans, biding their time in

hopes of a revival and some support in high places.

Some of that looked-for aid was to come in the person of the new Archbishop. Parker, a tired and disillusioned old man, was ready for his death in 1575. His letters show that he spent his last months mostly in retirement, reading and completing some of the scholarly tasks he had chosen for himself.

I toy out my time, partly with copying of books, partly in devising ordinances for scholars to help the ministry, partly in genealogies and so forth; for I have little help (if ye knew all) where I thought to have had most. And thus, till Almighty God cometh, I repose myself in patience.⁵³

A recent biographer had this to say of him:

(As Archbishop) Parker was just right. He really believed, quite passionately, in the sort of Church which was envisaged--dignified, preserving continuity with the past, maintaining all that seemed essential to Catholicity while shedding medieval accretions. He was gentle and conciliatory in dealing with critics either on the right hand or the left. He laboured all he could to correct abuses and to raise the standard of the clergy. And he was eminently one whose character commanded respect--without guile or duplicity, humble and without self-seeking or love of money; mild and conciliatory yet unyielding where he thought principles were concerned...It is not easy to imagine a man better suited to nurse the Elizabethan Church in its early and perilous days.⁵⁴

His successor was the former Archbishop of York, Edmund Grindal, whose tenure at Canterbury was to prove passively sympathetic, if not actively supportive, to the Puritans.

INTERLUDE IN DISCIPLINE

When Grindal came to Lambeth, he soon found that the Queen considered him in her employ and expected him to do her bidding as faithfully as had his predecessor. This posed many problems for the former Archbishop of York, for he had a strong conscience about his liberal beliefs and practices. While a priest, and even after he attained the lesser cathedra, he was relatively uninhibited. It was possible for one to be practically a thorough-going Calvinist in England and yet remain within the structure of the English Church, provided one was careful. If the Prayer Book was not neglected, other forms of worship could also be used; if episcopacy was not openly flaunted, clerical organizations of various kinds could be set up.⁵⁵ Among the lesser clergy such things might be done unobtrusively, but it was unthinkable that an Archbishop of Canterbury would encourage them under the very nose of the Queen. This Grindal did, and suffered for it.

Elizabeth was strong, and she knew what she wanted. The seeming strength of the Puritans and recusants alike fell before her.

Elizabeth distrusted the papists because of their allegiance to Rome, and the protestants because of their allegiance to Geneva. People who took their orders from some continental power were not wholeheartedly English. And that was what Elizabeth wanted--and English church designed to meet the spiritual needs of the English people.⁵⁶

Many of the protests of the Puritans about the lack of ecclesiastical discipline and the materialism of the clergy had sound basis in fact. This was partly due to the royal example, unfortunately, for Elizabeth was not above her father's tricks of taking the income of vacant benefices. Nonetheless, the situation of the clergy grieved her, and she was determined to do something constructive about it. Under her direction, Grindal inaugurated the only important program of his tenure, that of drawing up canons on the ministry. These dealt with orderly procedures for ordination, preaching, catechising and filling benefices. Approved by Convocation, these were published as the Canons of 1576 and are considered important guidelines for subsequent regulations.⁵⁷

The Queen was informed that the meetings of "prophesyings" or "exercises" were causing unrest and dissent among clergy and laity alike, and called upon her Archbishop to command their cessation. Due to his personal support of these, Grindal was unwilling to fulfill his sovereign's order. In fact, his reply was to implore the Queen to relinquish her role in ecclesiastical affairs, and turn the government of the Church entirely over to the bishops. Enraged that he would stand up to her as the Commons had often tried to do, Elizabeth simply bypassed him in implementing her directions. A general letter was sent to the bishops, which said, in part,

We...charge and command you... to take order through your diocese...that no manner of public and divine service, nor other form of the administration of the holy sacraments, nor any other rites or ceremonies,

be in any sort used in the Church but directly according to the orders established by our laws. Neither that any manner of person be suffered within your diocese to preach, teach, read, or any wise exercise any function in the Church but such as shall be lawfully approved and licensed.⁵⁸

This marked the beginning of a very difficult situation for the Queen in relation to the Church. She ordered her Archbishop sequestered for his disobedience, and worked through his subordinates. Eventually, she desired to have him removed from his post as chief Pastor of the English Church, but was persuaded by her advisors to keep him on and avoid scandal.

On the Roman Catholic side of the picture, the seminary-priests were hard at work among both recusants and those who professed following the established religion. Three had received orders in 1573, and that number increased substantially over the subsequent years. The Church in England was in a state of disorder, and the discipline of Rome was appealing. The Church in England was spiritually apathetic, and the enthusiasm of Rome was appealing. The Church in England offered little opportunity for lay participation, and the excitement (and danger) of recusancy was appealing. The religion of Rome was now seen as something very different from the quiet, retiring piety of the Marian bishops.

The new seminary priests were an invading army. Brought up and trained abroad in the new Tridentine servicebooks, expert in controversy and in the arts of dissimulation which penal laws fostered, buoyed up by false hopes and even ludicrous misrepresentations from England, alienated from the spirit of their country, and infected with the views of her political enemies, it was no wonder that by Englishmen

as a whole they were regarded very differently from the old-fashioned Marian priests.⁵⁹

Thus, though they received strong support from their co-religionists, they were bitterly persecuted by the government with the sympathy of the populace. Militant Romanism was a threat, not only religiously, but also politically, especially against the life of the Queen. Papists posed real dangers, and stern measures were taken against them. Neill observes, "It is fear that makes men cruel. For many years Elizabeth and her ministers lived in fear."⁶⁰

On November 30, 1577, the first seminary-priest was executed for treason. For years prior to this time, recusancy had been winked at, or punished by wrist-slapping fines or minimal imprisonments. Those days were over, and the government made wholesale arrests. Many who were arrested, however, were soon released, for it was leaders rather than followers who were being sought. Two more were executed in 1578.

While the focus of governmental attention was diverted from them, the Puritans published in 1578 the "Form of Common Prayer," a modification of the Genevan Prayer Book. This book, which they used in their secret meetings, omitted the use of the title, "priest," as well as such services as private baptism, confirmation and churching of women, which they held to be popish superstition. They were to present this book to Parliament three times (1585, 1587, 1589) and each time the Queen would thwart their efforts to have it approved.⁶¹

Seminary-priests were joined in their assault on the English Church in 1579 by Jesuits, most of whom were also trained in skillful debate and subtle argumentation. Among them, two men deserve special mention, Parsons and Campion. The former was wily and shrewd, a born plotter who sought out intrigue and adventure. The latter, a pious and scholarly man, evoked admiration from all but his heartiest opponents.

With all the increased activity of the Roman Catholics, it was felt necessary to enact a statute to deal more specifically with the situation than did the act of 1571 against bringing papal bulls into the country and publishing them. In 1581 "An Act to retain the Queen's Majesty's Subjects in their due Obedience" was enacted. Directed especially toward Jesuits and "seminaries," it read in part,

All persons whatsoever which have, or shall have, or shall pretend to have power, or shall by any ways or means put in practice to absolve, persuade, or withdraw any of the Queen's Majesty's subjects or any within her Highness's realms and dominions from their natural obedience to her Majesty, or to withdraw them for that intent from the religion now by her Highness's authority established within her Highness's dominions to the Romish religion, or to move them or any of them to promise any obedience to any pretended authority of the See of Rome, or of any other prince, state, or potentate, to be had or used within her dominions, or shall do any overt act to that intent or purpose, and every of them, shall be to all intents adjudged to be traitors.⁶²

Under the increased stringency of this statute, Campion and some thirty others suffered the death penalty for treason. The total number of executions by the end of the reign was to reach 124 clergy, 63 laymen.

The great question surrounding these deaths was voiced through England and across the Continent: were men, in fact, being punished for their treason, or for their religion? The answer, of course, depended to a large extent whether one's sympathies lay with the Romans or the English. The issue which brought them to the gallows was whether they would repudiate the Pope's affirmation that he had power to depose the Queen. If this is held to be a religious question, then it may be argued that they were executed for their religious beliefs. If, as Frere puts it, "it was a mistaken legacy of medieval papal statecraft," then they died for an offence which was legitimately designated treasonable.⁶³

Early in the 1580's another movement was beginning which was to have far greater implications for the development of the Christian community in England than could ever have been imagined by its contemporaries. Robert Browne, a noted preacher, was constrained to give up both his homiletics license and his whole vocation as priest. He had come to believe that a visible Church was unnecessary, and indeed, evil and corrupt. The Spirit of God could not be contained by tangible structure and discipline; armed with this partial truth, he proclaimed a new community wherein all who were truly led by the Spirit would congregate. This was far more radical a notion than most Puritans had had, and was not sanctioned by them. They still felt that it was possible and urgent to work within the Church, to reform it rather than to fragment it by withdrawal. Browne

published a manifesto called "Reformation without tarrying for any," in which he attacked those reformers who were only willing to go halfway, as he saw it. One could not compromise with Satan, but must eschew his company entirely. The fact that Browne later retracted his opinions and settled down as an obscure country priest could not undo the harm he had begun. Printers who continued to make his work available to the public despite royal orders were executed, the first protestant "martyrs" under Elizabeth. In later years, "Brownists" and others of similar leanings were to raise havoc with the established Church; for now they were fairly quiescent.⁶⁴

Grindal died quietly in sequestration in 1583, and was succeeded by one whose militant policies and strict adherence to his sovereign were to set him in sharp contrast to his predecessor.

RENEWED STRINGENCY

John Whitgift was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1583 until the end of Elizabeth's reign. In him was found a unique combination of Calvinistic theology and episcopal polity. While he looked to Calvin as one of the Church's greatest thinkers, he repudiated entirely the presbyterian polity for which Calvin stood in the minds of most of Europe. Knappen says that "He developed easily and naturally into a middle-aged tory, a firm supporter of the status quo which use and custom had confirmed."⁶⁵ His public and private records were virtually unspotted, and his zeal for his work disconcerted his enemies. Many of the methods which he was to employ came under severe criticism and attack from allies as well as foes, but his motives for purifying the Church were unquestionably good.

Among his first reforms were those dealing particularly with the clergy. There were to be no further cures held by juveniles or unlearned men, and all the clergy were to subscribe to the three items demanded by Parker, viz., the Royal Supremacy, the Prayer Book and the Thirty-nine Articles. It was the second of these which occasioned wide-spread objection among the Puritans. They were required to state that they found nothing in the Book of Common Prayer which was not conformable to the Word of God. As has been seen above, men of Cartwright's persuasion would have great difficulty doing this in good conscience.

Whitgift obtained for the Court of High Commission a prerogative which gave it immense power. This was the renowned ex officio oath, under which men could be forced to testify against themselves. A series of twenty-four questions was designed to deal with all the issues raised by the Puritans. In this oath, Whitgift had a frighteningly effective weapon. Men were sworn in, then asked about their attitudes towards such things as use of the surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, the wedding ring, churching of women, and the litany and burial office. No conscientious Puritan could avoid implicating himself under these conditions, and even Burghley wrote to Whitgift that England was beginning to look like Spain under the Inquisition.

The only saving factor for the Puritans was that the lawyers who dealt with common law were thoroughly disgusted with the bishops and their ecclesiastical law. The Church had been meddling in the affairs of common law by extending canonical law, these lawyers felt. Therefore, they were glad of the opportunity to defend the Puritans against the Church. "The Puritans might sometimes lose their cases, but, with the common lawyers in alliance with them, the victorious adversaries generally suffered considerably before an incumbent was finally deprived."⁶⁶

Whitgift's policies also provoked reaction in Commons, the body which had been reliably supporting the Puritans. A petition for ecclesiastical reform was initiated there in 1584.⁶⁷

Clerical reforms similar to what Whitgift had already initiated were demanded by Commons, together with requests for the repeal of the ex officio oath, retention of the scholarly preachers who were now being deprived, and censure of those whose conduct and ignorance made them manifestly unworthy of their calling. This petition, however, like all those initiated by Commons regarding religion, did not get beyond the Queen's representatives. A move to put the Geneva Prayer Book in place of the Book of Common Prayer in all parishes, at least to use both, was also quickly defeated.

While **fighting in Parliament** and in courts of law, Puritans were also taking direct action against the bishops. Despite the statutes forbidding it, the presbyterian classis system was being utilized within or alongside the legal episcopal polity. Ordination at the hands of a bishop was received to fulfill the requirements of the law, but little was done beyond that in accordance with the established religion of the realm. Practically the only recourse to the Prayer Book in parishes which were dominated by classes was for the lectionary. Organization and government of these parishes was in the hands of elders and deacons who had received 'supplementary' ordination from non-episcopal sources.

Even though they acted outside the law, many Puritans longed for reconciliation and a meeting of minds with the Churchmen. When Whitgift had made his show of strength, he seemed ready to sit back and reap the fruits of his labors.

Some of the pressures he had exerted were relaxed a bit and only flagrant disobedience was punished. Puritans, he found, were willing to help preserve order and discipline within the Church if they were not required to submit to what they considered extremes of dogma. They were willing to make greater use of the Prayer Book, for instance, when they were not forced to declare it conformable to Scripture in its entirety.

This new attitude on the part of the Archbishop brought Cartwright back from his continental refuge and into a place of prominence on the English scene. It seemed that now it might be possible for the Church and the Puritans to present a united front to recusancy.

Danger to the Queen increased with the continued presence of subversive Jesuits and seminary-priests, and new plots were continually being uncovered. The Throckmorton Plot in 1583, followed by the assassination of William the Silent in the Low Countries, brought to a head the need for action. Parliament passed "An Act against Jesuits, Seminary Priests, and such other like disobedient Persons" in 1585. By this act, these persons were banished from the realm as traitors, and if any remained after a period of forty days, they were to be executed.⁶⁸ The same penalty was invoked against those recusants who knowingly sheltered them.

It was clear that the Pope was behind most of these plots against Elizabeth, for he was determined to see that his bull was carried out. The natural rallying-point for the

revolutionaries was Mary, Queen of Scots. Many recusants believed that she was rightfully Queen of England, and would bend all their efforts to see her crowned. Papal agents encouraged all the disloyalty they could. "It became increasingly clear that the papacy, by attempting to recover England through foul means, had forfeited the chance of doing so by fair ones."⁶⁹ Conspirators from Scotland, Spain and France were working for the overthrow of the government, as were native recusants. Steps were taken to safeguard the Queen's life, including the formation of "The Association for the Preservation of Her Majesty." Elizabeth remained calm throughout the situation.

Speculation was going on meanwhile as to who would become the Master of Temple Church. Most Puritans felt that Walter Travers was the natural candidate for such a significant post, especially since he was a lecturer of note there already. The Queen, it seems, had other ideas. Richard Hooker, a man about whom very little is really known, was chosen to fill the vacancy on March 17, 1585.⁷⁰ These men had long been in debate over polity, and continued propagating their divergent views at the Temple for some time. Hooker would preach episcopacy in the morning, Travers presbyterianism in the afternoon. Conflict also arose over two questions of doctrine, predestination and faith in God's promises. Hooker was willing to admit the use of man's reason into the arena of theology, but Travers maintained that one must accept the literal words of

Scripture (as he read them) without acknowledging the need for interpretation. This debate lasted about a year, after which Travers was removed from his post by the Archbishop, and sent to Trinity College, Dublin, where it was thought he could do less harm.⁷¹

In the fall of 1586, in preparation for the Parliament which was soon to convene, many petitions were sent to the Queen, the bishops and the Council, declaring the urgency of Church reform. Of particular concern was a strong preaching ministry and the restoration of those who had been 'unjustly' deprived. The way to see that these abuses were not continued was obvious to the Puritans: establish presbyterianism as the official polity. To this end, a bill was introduced in Parliament and the Genevan Prayer Book was again submitted. The intervention of the Queen was again the deciding factor, and the "Bill and the Book" went down to defeat.⁷²

Returning to the plots against the Queen, we note that Mary was doubtless unaware of many of those conspirators who would set her in Elizabeth's place. Her complicity in some plots is sure, but many were without her knowledge. The most serious one of all was the Babington plot of 1586. Babington was an intimate of Elizabeth, whom she had kept close, heedless of warnings from her counselors. Walsingham, the Secretary of State, had an elaborate system of spies, and was in close contact with the Babington plot almost from its inception.. He even knew what was contained in Mary's private correspondence,

and bided his time as to when he would spring his trap. This he did in the autumn of 1586, and the news threw the country into a panic. If someone this high in the government was deeply involved in attempting to assassinate the Queen, things had indeed come to a critical point. Both Houses of Parliament asked that Mary be executed, The alternatives were weighed, and Elizabeth reluctantly gave her consent. Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, was beheaded on February 8, 1587.⁷³

Travers had been commissioned by the Puritans to revise their Book of Discipline, which set forth their presbyterial polity apologetically. This he did, clarifying the positions of bishops and elders within the Church. He substituted the terms "doctor and pastor" for bishops, "governor and deacon" for elder, and delineated their functions carefully. A lengthy reply, polemical in style, came from Dr. John Bridges, who was self-appointed defender of the faith. He lived to regret his enthusiasm, for his fourteen hundred pages provoked a new and devastating turn in the controversy between Puritan and Church.

A tract appeared to rebut Bridges in a novel manner. "Martin Marprelate," as the author called himself, set out to rebuke the abuses in the Church by satire. Bridges was the first to suffer ridicule, but many more were to follow. The old Puritan complaints were dressed in a new and appealing garb: humor. Many had long thought the Puritans too long-faced, and were delighted at this turn of events. Martin was quite

popular among the common people, but the Church was incensed and even the Puritans themselves feared what his influence might do to their cause. Moderates like Cartwright, sometimes accused of sympathizing with this scurrilous writing, were in fact singularly opposed to it. They were probably as much relieved as the Church when the outlaw printing press was discovered and no further tracts were printed. Martin himself admitted that he was not popular with the Puritans. "Those whom foolishly men call Puritans like of the matter I have handled, but the form they cannot brook."^{73a} "The Puritans are angrie with me, I meane the puritane preachers. And why? Because I am to open. Because I iest."⁷⁴ Jestings was what the Puritans objected to in Martin, for they felt he was treating lightly a matter which was so serious in its implications that humor distracted from pointing up its sinfulness. Marprelate's disappearance from the English scene caused no consternation among either Churchmen or Puritans.

An event which was of great consternation to the entire country was the arrival of the Spanish Armada in July, 1588. Partly for religious reasons, to be sure, but more due to political considerations, the King of Spain was heeding the call of the Pope to implement his deposition of "the servant of wickedness," Elizabeth Tudor. The Armada was renowned throughout the world as the most powerful striking force of the day, and the mere mention of it set off panic among adversaries of Spain. Thus it was seen as a Providential deliverance when a

combination of British sea power and terrible storms devastated the Spaniards, scattered their fleet and dealt them a blow from which they would never recover militarily.

Danger from abroad was over. The Queen was now freed to concentrate on the more insidious problems of religion which remained at home, within the Church, and, soon after, outside it.

CONCLUDING CLASHES

The next five years were busy ones for Whitgift and his agents. Although, with the defeat of the Armada, recusancy had been severed from any political hopes of taking control of the realm, religious zeal remained a barrier to Church unity. Puritans were, on the whole, still dedicated to bringing their presbyterian polity into the Church. Perhaps most dangerous of all were the Separatists who felt that they could no longer bear with the evils and abuses of the visible Church, and so seceded to form a more "spiritual" body. Because of the radical nature of their movement, the Separatists were first to receive the attention of the Church.

It will be remembered that Browne had renounced his errors and returned to the Church, but some of his followers persisted as sectaries. Henry Barrow, in his Brief Discovery of the False Church of 1590 said that, after the time of the Apostles, men had relinquished their faith,

whereupon the true pattern of Christ's Testament, so highly and with so great charge incommended by the Apostles unto the fidelity of the whole Church, was soon neglected and cast aside, especially by these evil workmen these governors, who some of them affecting the preeminence, sought to draw an absolute power into their own hands, perverting those offices of more labour and care into swelling titles of fleshly pomp and world dignity... Then were these called bishops.⁵

He went on to describe the 'true' church as one in which

excommunication, election, ordination, etc., is not committed into the hands of one particular person, as the Pope and his natural children our Lord Bishops now use it; nor yet into the hands of the eldership

only or of the pastors of many particular congregations (as the reforming preachers would have it), so much as it is given and committed to the Whole Church even to every particular congregation, and to every member thereof alike.⁷⁶

Those who held these views were fugitive from the law, for they denied that the Queen was Governor of the Church, and admitted that she might be excommunicated (though, of course, not suggesting that the Pope had power to do this, as seen in the second quotation from Barrow). The charismatic leaders of the Separatists in this later period were Barrow and Greenwood, who conducted much of their work from prison where they often found themselves.

The problems raised by the presence of such dissenters were dealt with in the Act to retain the Queen's Subjects in Obedience, in 1593.⁷⁷ By this act, those "seditious sectaries... which shall obstinately refuse to repair to some church, chapel, or usual place of common prayer to hear Divine Service established by her Majesty's laws and statutes" were to be imprisoned for felony or banished from the realm. The same fate applied to those who attended conventicles or other meetings for religious purposes outside the statutory provisions. A large colony of Separatists left England and established themselves in Amsterdam. A further section of the act of 1593 provided that, should they return, they would be subject to execution.

In this same year, 1593, a law was passed restricting further the activities of popish recusants. Either they might be arrested for their profession of a religion considered

subversive to the realm, or, upon making submission publicly at Divine Service, be restrained from travelling more than five miles from their homes.⁷⁸ To see the necessity for this, we must retrace our steps to 1588. Following the defeat of the Armada, some papists were incarcerated for complicity with foreign agents. Instead of taking this as a warning, others began to engage in subversive activities. There were a few executions in 1589-90, and a large number in 1591. There were rumors that Spain was building a new fleet with the avowed intent of recapturing her supremacy of the seas, and this hurt the cause of the recusants in England considerably.

For the most part, those Roman Catholics who were imprisoned were model prisoners and Christians. "The rank and file of the sufferers were characterized by a beautiful piety and simple loyalty to Christ, whose service called them to their perilous task, and whose love supported them in misery and death."⁷⁹

Richard Bancroft, chief agent of Whitgift, preached a sermon in 1589 which struck at the heart of the disaffection of the Puritans. He showed that there were indeed false prophets in England, as charged, but the reason they were there, was because of the contempt of the bishops. If the episcopal system were working as it always had, prior to Puritan agitation for presbyterianism, the land and the Church would be much better off. The real difficulty, he contended, lay in the area of ecclesiastical polity.⁸⁰

To meet this situation there arose the greatest apologist since Jewel, probably the greatest of all post-Reformation apologists, Richard Hooker. As Master of the Temple and constantly exposed to Travers as noted above, Hooker was in a position to hear a good deal of Puritan ideas, and had a superb mind and pen with which to answer them. As many have agreed, he was often able to state his opponents' position better than they could. After he had exhausted the strengths of their beliefs, he would turn to an even more brilliant demolition of them. It is necessary to quote at length from his magnum opus, Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, to gain the flavor of his thought. He is concerned to disprove the Puritan thesis, especially touching polity, "that the Scripture of God is in such sort the rule of human actions, that simply whatsoever we do and are not by it directed thereunto, the same is sin."⁸¹ To do this, he shows that God speaks to man in diverse ways.

Wisdom hath diversely imparted her treasures unto the world. As her ways are of sundry kinds, so her manner of teaching is not merely one and the same. Some things she openeth by the sacred books of Scripture; some things by the glorious works of Nature; with some things she inspireth them from above by spiritual influence; in some things she leadeth and traineth them only by worldly experience and practice. We may not so in any one special kind admire her, that we disgrace her in any other; but let all her ways be according unto their place and degree adored.⁸²

Maintaining that whatever is not commanded or forbidden in Scripture is left to man's reason to determine, he goes on to demonstrate that even the Puritans operate on this principle, which they profess to abhor.

The force of arguments drawn from the authority of Scripture itself, as Scriptures commonly are alleged, shall (being sifted) be found to depend upon the strength of this so much despised and debased authority of man....Is not their surest ground most commonly, either some probable conjecture of their own, or the judgment of others taking those Scriptures as they do?....They ground themselves on human authority even when they most pretend divine.⁸³

Hooker himself refuses to stoop to an argument which claims that polity, which is actually mutable, can be grounded in Scripture.

If therefore we did seek to maintain that which most advantageth our own cause, the very best way for us and the strongest against them were to hold even as they do, that in Scripture there must needs be found some particular form of church polity which God hath instituted, and which for that very cause belongeth to all churches, to all times. But with any such partial eye to respect ourselves, and by cunning to make those things seem the truest which are the fittest to serve our purpose, is a thing which we neither like nor mean to follow.⁸⁴

His honesty prevented him from turning the Laws into an apology for episcopacy, but served to show the Puritans that there were men of integrity in the opposite camp whose beliefs were at least as defensible as their own.

The first four books of this work were published in 1594, the last in 1597. Moorman states that it was meant as an irenicon as well as an apology,⁸⁵ and even Knappen admits that Hooker has not, to this day, been refuted.⁸⁶ The only attempt in his time was A Christian Letter of Certain English Protestants (1599), and that ignored his main points and is characterized by a tone of defeat.

The closing years of the reign were fairly peaceful ones

on the ecclesiastical scene. The Lambeth Articles of 1595 were Calvinistic in tone, and represented concessions to Puritan thought. As usual, however, such compromise was blocked by the Queen, and these were never ratified. The Canons of 1597 took cognizance of some of the clerical issues raised by Puritans, enlarging the concepts of the 1585 canons and preparing for the important revisions which would be made early in the succeeding reign.

When the oath ex officio was tendered to Cartwright in 1591, he refused to take it on the grounds that it was not consistent with the laws of the land, and went contrary to the will of the Queen. The examiners accused him of dishonoring his Queen by such talk, and offered him again the opportunity to swear to the oath. This he refused, and imprisonment followed. He was exiled to the Channel Islands in 1593, and spent the last ten years of his life there.

With the back of the opposition broken, the Church of England began to flourish. Theology was restored to its own in the ensuing calm. Hooker at Oxford, and Andrewes and Overall at Cambridge led in the revitalization of questions more significant than those with which they had, of necessity, been dealing prior to that time. Church buildings were restored and refurbished, and many new ones were built to accommodate the crowds who were beginning to become interested in the Church again, now that the strife seemed over.⁸⁷

The Queen died on March 24, 1603, leaving behind a Church which was very different from the one she had found upon her accession forty-five years prior. The deepest imprint upon the Church of England was decidedly hers. To see to what extent this was true, and for what reasons, we turn to our concluding remarks.

REFLECTIONS ON FORTY-FIVE YEARS

Like her father, Elizabeth was concerned about religious matters to a great degree directly in relation to how ~~they~~ affected the political tenor of the realm. Her preference for the via media was conditioned by the belief that national political unity depended largely upon a national Church, rather than the conviction that this middle way in religion was the most biblical or historical. Fortunately for the Church, her Lord is able to use even base motives to advantage, and from the Settlement of 1559 has sprung a great and fruitful branch of Christendom.

Until the preceding page, we have assiduously avoided use of the phrase, "the Church of England" in describing the Settlement. This phrase denotes that entity which was to become the mother of the Anglican Communion, and which cannot correctly be said to exist qua entity until the close of the Elizabethan period. Then, conceived under God and nurtured by the Queen, Anglicanism grew...but not without suffering.

The Tudor claim that the Sovereign was Supreme Head (later, Governor) of the Church led to a gigantic combination of powers. The break with Rome was a denial of the unity of Christendom under the Pope. The Church was pillaged and manipulated by the Crown, to the detriment of its

spiritual functions. Unscrupulous men took advantage of the vulnerability of the Church at this time to feather their own caps. They received property from the Crown which had been the Church's, put their young sons in rich benefices and similar devious practices. Religious tolerance was rare, and many were persecuted or killed for their faith or lack of it. There were grim aspects to the Settlement.

On the other hand, there is much to be said in its favor. It was truly a reformation of the Church, in that **many** medieval abuses, sacred and secular, were swept away. Lands which had fallen to the Church by default or intrigue were 'repossessed.' Christian unity was proclaimed in the more biblical terms of one flock under the one Shepherd Christ, rather than the Bishop of Rome who had usurped that role. More religious tolerance existed in England under Elizabeth than anywhere else in the world at that time, and the leniency she showed was to have long-range effects in favor of more liberal treatment for religious dissenters. Although to us moderns death seems an unreasonable sentence for heresy and unbelief, it must be borne in mind that this was the common penalty for petty crimes such as sheep-stealing.

The age of Elizabeth was very different from our own, and we must move slowly in attempting to assess it.

A grand and lasting heritage has been left by Christians in the Elizabethan Church. The biblical faith was kept intact through the storms of controversy, and many early customs and rites were revived. The authority of the Creeds and the first four Councils was reaffirmed, and the Scriptures and services made available to the common man more and more. Communion in both kinds was restored and laymen were urged to communicate often. Apostolic succession and the three-fold ministry were preserved. Superstitions such as transubstantiation, purgatory and indulgences were repudiated.

The Church of England had become truly catholic, truly reformed and truly evangelical. It stood for the rights of individual differences, within the bond of love and fellowship. It sought to be as inclusive as possible, and so bequeathed to us the richness of diversity which characterizes our Communion today. "The Anglican Churches are today, in all essentials, what the Elizabethan Settlement made them."⁸⁸

FOOTNOTES

- ¹G. M. Trevelyan. A Shortened History of England. (London: Longmans, 1942), p. 201.
- ²H. M. Smith. Henry VIII and the Reformation. (New York: MacMillan, 1948), p. 16.
- ³T. M. Parker. The English Reformation to 1558. (London, Oxford Press, 1950), p. 54.
- ⁴Ibid., pp. 59-60.
- ⁵J. R. Tanner. Tudor Constitutional Documents. (Cambridge: University Press, 1951), p. 17.
- ⁶Ibid., pp. 21-22, 25-29.
- ⁷Parker, pp. 62-70.
- ⁸Ibid., p. 71.
- ⁹Ibid., pp. 72-74.
- ¹⁰J. R. H. Moorman. A History of the Church in England. (New York: Morehouse, 1954), p. 167f.
- ¹¹Parker, p. 112f.
- ¹²Moorman, p. 188f., cf. Parker, p. 129ff.
- ¹³Parker, p. 155ff.
- ¹⁴Ibid., p. 166.
- ¹⁵J. B. Black. The Reign of Elizabeth. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1959), p. 3.
- ¹⁶Ibid., p. 26.
- ¹⁷R. W. Dixon. History of the Church of England, vol. 5. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1902), p. 23.
- ¹⁸Tanner, p. 131.
- ¹⁹W. H. Frere. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. (London: MacMillan, 1904), p. 26.

- ²⁰S. Neill. Anglicanism. (London: Penguin, 1958), p. 131.
- ²¹Black, p. 13.
- ²²Frere, p. 38.
- ²³Ibid., p. 36f.
- ²⁴Dixon, vol. 5, p. 40.
- ²⁵Frere, p. 56.
- ²⁶Ibid., p. 75ff.
- ²⁷J. Jewel. An Apology of the Church of England. (Ithaca: Cornell, 1963), p. xxxvii.
- ²⁸Frere, p. 106.
- ²⁹The Book of Common Prayer. (New York: Pension Fund, certified 1945), Article 28, p. 608.
- ³⁰Frere, p. 100.
- ³¹Dixon, vol. 5, p. 377.
- ³²Ibid., p. 411.
- ³³Moorman, p. 217.
- ³⁴Frere, p. 122.
- ³⁵Ibid., p. 127.
- ³⁶Moorman, p. 206.
- ³⁷Frere, p. 144.
- ³⁸Ibid., p. 148ff.
- ³⁹Dixon, vol. 6, p. 278.
- ⁴⁰V. J. K. Brook. A Life of Archbishop Parker. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), p. 257.
- ⁴¹Frere, p. 167.
- ⁴²Ibid., p. 167f.
- ⁴³M. M. Knappen. Tudor Puritanism. (Chicago: University, 1939), p. 255.

- ⁴⁴J. Strype. Annals of the Reformation. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1824), vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 612.
- ⁴⁵W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas, ed. Puritan Manifestoes. (London: S.P.C.K., 1907), p. 8.
- ⁴⁶Ibid., p. 15.
- ⁴⁷Ibid., p. 21.
- ⁴⁸Ibid., p. 35f.
- ⁴⁹Frere, p. 179ff.
- ⁵⁰S. J. Knox. Walter Travers. (London: Methuen, 1962), p. 36.
- ⁵¹A. F. S. Pearson. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism. (Cambridge: University, 1925), p. 143.
- ⁵²Knappen, p. 249.
- ⁵³Brook, p. 337.
- ⁵⁴Ibid., p. 344f.
- ⁵⁵Moorman, p. 209f.
- ⁵⁶Ibid., p. 212.
- ⁵⁷Frere, p. 192.
- ⁵⁸Tanner, p. 185.
- ⁵⁹Frere, p. 207.
- ⁶⁰Neill, p. 108.
- ⁶¹Knappen, p. 287.
- ⁶²Tanner, p. 152.
- ⁶³Frere, p. 220f.
- ⁶⁴Ibid., p. 202f.
- ⁶⁵Knappen, p. 266.

- ⁶⁶Ibid., p. 273.
- ⁶⁷Tanner, p. 190ff.
- ⁶⁸Ibid., p. 154ff.
- ⁶⁹Frere, p. 240.
- ⁷⁰Knox, p. 69.
- ⁷¹Ibid., p. 75ff.
- ⁷²Pearson, p. 254ff.
- ⁷³Frere, p. 243ff.
- ^{73a}Pearson, p. 283f.
- ⁷⁴Ibid., p. 281.
- ⁷⁵Tanner, p. 187.
- ⁷⁶Ibid., p. 190.
- ⁷⁷Ibid., p. 197ff.
- ⁷⁸Ibid., p. 159ff.
- ⁷⁹Frere, p. 269.
- ⁸⁰Ibid., p. 275.
- ⁸¹R. Hooker. Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity,
vol. 1. (London: Dent, 1907), ii-iii, p. 236.
- ⁸²Ibid., ii-iv, p. 237.
- ⁸³Ibid., ii-ix, p. 274f.
- ⁸⁴Ibid., iii-viii, p. 334f.
- ⁸⁵Moorman, p. 216.
- ⁸⁶Knappen, p. 301.
- ⁸⁷Frere, p. 284
- ⁸⁸Neill, p. 131.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bettenson, Henry, ed., Documents of the Christian Church (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947)
- Black, J.B., The Reign of Elizabeth, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959)
- Brook, V.J.K., A Life of Archbishop Parker, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962)
- Cremeans, Charles David, The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949)
- Dixon, Richard Watson, History of the Church of England, Vol. 5&6 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902)
- Frere, W.H., The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (London: MacMillan and Co., 1904)
- Frere, W.H. and Douglas, C.E., ed., Puritan Manifestoes (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1907)
- Gairdner, James, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary (London: Macmillan and Co., 1903)
- Gee, Henry and Hardy, William John, ed., Documents Illustrative of English Church History (London: MacMillan and Co., 1896)
- Hooker, Richard, Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Vol. I (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1907 (1963))
- Jewel, John, An Apology of the Church of England (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963)
- Knappen, M.M., Tudor Puritanism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939)
- Knox, S.J., Walter Travers (London: Methuen and Co., 1962)
- Meyer, Carl S., Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1960)
- Moorman, John R.H., A History of the Church in England (New York: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1954 (1963))

- Neale, J.E., Queen Elizabeth (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1934)
- Neill, Stephen, Anglicanism (London: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1958 (1960))
- Parker, T.M., The English Reformation to 1558 (London: Oxford University Press, 1950)
- Pearson, A.F. Scott, Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism (Cambridge: University Press, 1925)
- Powicke, Maurice, The Reformation in England (London: Oxford University Press, 1941 (1961))
- Rowse, A.L., The England of Elizabeth (New York: MacMillan Co., 1951)
- Shires, Henry M., "The Conflict Between Queen Elizabeth and Roman Catholicism." Church History, vol. XVI, #4, December, 1947.
- Smith, H. Maynard, Henry VIII and the Reformation (London: MacMillan and Co., 1948)
- Strype, John, Annals of the Reformation (4 volumes in 7 parts) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824)
- Tanner, J.R., Tudor Constitutional Documents (Cambridge: University Press, 1951)
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay, A Shortened History of England (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1942)